arXiv:math/0412262v1 [math.NT] 13 Dec 2004

ARTIN'S PRIMITIVE ROOT CONJECTURE
- a survey -

PIETER MOREE

Abstract. This is an expanded version of a write-up of a talk given 19-10-2000 at the DMV-seminar 'The Riemann zeta function and Random Matrix Theory' in Oberwolfach. A large part of it was intended to be understandable by non-number theorists with a mathematical background. The talk covered some of the history, results and ideas connected with Artin's celebrated primitive root conjecture dating from 1927. In the update several new results established after 2000 are also discussed.

Gauss considers in articles 315-317 of his Disquisitiones Arithmeticae (1801) the decimal expansion of numbers of the form $\frac{1}{p}$ with p prime. For example, $\frac{1}{7}=0.\underline{142857}142857\ldots$, $\frac{1}{11}=0.\underline{09}0909\ldots$.

These decimal expansions for $p\neq 2$ and $p\neq 5$ are purely periodic. It is easy to see that the period is equal to the smallest integer k such that $10^k\equiv 1(\text{mod }p)$. This integer k is the *multiplicative order* of 10 modulo p and is denoted by $\text{ord}_p(10)$. The integer k equals the order of the subgroup generated by 10 in $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$, the multiplicative subgroup of residue classes modulo p. By Lagrange's theorem the order of a subgroup of a finite group is a divisor of the number of elements in the group. Since $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$ has $p-1$ elements, we conclude that $\text{ord}_p(10)\mid p-1$. If $\text{ord}_p(10)=p-1$, we say that 10 is a *primitive root* mod p. The decimal expansion we have given for $\frac{1}{7}$ shows that 7 is a primitive root mod 10. Gauss' table gives several other such examples and he must have asked himself whether there are infinitely many such primes, that is, primes p for which the decimal period is $p-1$.

Some light on this question can be shed on using the simple observation (due to Chebyshev) that if $q=4p+1$ is a prime with p a prime satisfying $p\equiv 2(\text{mod }5)$, then 10 is a primitive root modulo q. To this end notice that, a priori, $\text{ord}_q(10)=\{1,2,4,p,2p,4p\}$. Now, using the law of quadratic reciprocity, see e.g. [27], one deduces that

$$10^{2p}\equiv\left(\frac{10}{q}\right)=\left(\frac{2}{q}\right)\left(\frac{5}{q}\right)=(-1)^{\frac{q^2-1}{8}}\left(\frac{q}{5}\right)=-\left(\frac{4}{5}\right)\equiv -1(\text{mod }q).$$

Since no prime divisor of 10^4-1 satisfies the requirements (and hence $\text{ord}_q(10)\nmid 4$), one sees that $\text{ord}_q(10)=4p=q-1$.

The *logarithmic integral* $\text{Li}(x)$ is defined as $\int_2^x dt/\log t$. The Prime Number Theorem in the form $\pi(x):=\#\{p\leq x\}\sim\text{Li}(x)$ as x tends to infinity (i.e. the quotient of the r.h.s. and l.h.s. tends to 1 as x tends to infinity), suggests that the 'probability that a number n is prime' is

$1/\log n$. Thus for both n and $4n+1$ to be prime and $n \equiv 2 (\text{mod } 5)$ we expect a probability of $1/(5\log^2 n)$, assuming independence of these three events. Since they are not, we have to correct by some positive constant c and hence expect that up to x there are at least $cx/\log^2 x$ (note that $\sum_{n\le x} \log^{-2} n \sim x\log^{-2} x$) primes p such that 10 is a primitive root mod p. Hence we expect that there are infinitely many primes p having 10 as a primitive root mod p. This conjecture is commonly ascribed to Gauss, however, to the author's knowledge there is no written evidence for it.

Emil Artin in 1927, led by a partial heuristic argument (sketched in §3), made the following conjecture, where for a given $g \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ we define $\mathcal{P}(g) = \{p : \text{ord}_p(g) = p-1\}$ and $\mathcal{P}(g)(x) = \#\{p \in \mathcal{P}(g) : p \le x\}$. (In general, if S is a set, we define $S(x) = \#\{s \in S : s \le x\}$.)

Artin's primitive root conjecture (1927) Let $g \in \mathbb{Q}\backslash\{-1,0,1\}$.
(Qualitative form) The set $\mathcal{P}(g)$ is infinite if g is not a square of a rational number.
(Quantitative form) Let h be the largest integer such that $g = g_0^h$ with $g_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$. We have, as x tends to infinity,

$$\mathcal{P}(g)(x) = \prod_{p\nmid h}\left(1-\frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right)\prod_{p\mid h}\left(1-\frac{1}{p-1}\right)\frac{x}{\log x} + o\left(\frac{x}{\log x}\right). \qquad (1)$$

Denote the product appearing in (1) by $A(h)$. Note that $A(h) = 0$ when h is even. Then $\mathcal{P}(g)$ is finite and assertion (1) is trivial. Thus the condition that g is not a square is necessary (and according to Artin sufficient) for $\mathcal{P}(g)$ to be infinite. For h odd we have that $A(h)$ equals a positive rational multiple of

$$A(1) = A = \prod_p \left(1-\frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right) \approx 0.3739558136192\ldots,$$

the *Artin constant.* Thus the quantitative form implies the qualitative form.

The product defining the Artin constant does not converge too quickly. It turns out that for numerical approximations it is possible and indeed much more efficient to write $A = \prod_{k=2}^{\infty} \zeta(k)^{-e_k}$, with $e_k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-s}$ the celebrated zetafunction of Riemann. This then allows one to determine A without too much effort with 1000 decimal precision as zetavalues can be easily evaluated with high numerical precision, cf [38].

Usually one speaks about the Artin primitive root conjecture, rather than Artin's conjecture since there are various unresolved conjectures due to Artin (most notably the Artin holomorphy conjecture).

The remainder of the talk consists of the following 8 parts :

1) Naive heuristic approach

2) Algebraic number theory

3) Artin's heuristic approach

4) Modified heuristic approach (à la Artin)

5) Hooley's work

6) Probabilistic model

7) The indicator function

8) Some variations of Artin's problem

Our starting point in our analysis of Artin's primitive root conjecture is the following observation :

$$p \in \mathcal{P}(g) \iff g^{\frac{p-1}{q}} \not\equiv 1 (\text{mod } p) \text{ for every prime } q \text{ dividing } p-1. \qquad (2)$$

"$\Longrightarrow$" Obvious.
"$\Longleftarrow$" Suppose $p \notin \mathcal{P}(g)$. Then $g^{\frac{p-1}{k}} \equiv 1(\text{mod } p)$ for some $k \mid (p-1)$, $k > 1$. But this implies that $g^{\frac{p-1}{q_1}} \equiv 1(\text{mod } p)$ for some prime divisor q_1 of k. This is a contradiction.

Thus, associated with a prime p we have conditions for various q. We are going to interchange the role of p and q, that is for a fixed q we consider the set of primes p such that $p \equiv 1(\text{mod } q)$ and $g^{\frac{p-1}{q}} \not\equiv 1(\text{mod } p)$.

I would like to point out, by the way, that there is more to decimal expansions than meets the eye. For example, Girstmair [6] proved that if a prime p is such that its decimal expansion $1/p = 0.x_1x_2\cdots x_{p-1}x_1\cdots$ has period $p-1$, then the difference between the sums of its even and odd places, namely $(x_2 + x_4 + \cdots + x_{p-1}) - (x_1 + x_3 + \cdots + x_{p-2})$, is $11h_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-p})}$ if $p \equiv 3(\text{mod } 4)$ and is zero otherwise, where $h_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-p})}$ denotes the so-called class number of the imaginary quadratic number field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-p})$ (I briefly discuss number fields in §2). Other examples are provided in §8.2, part 11 of §8.6 and Khare [18].

`Warning`. This survey does not aim to be methodical and complete, rather it reflects the taste and likes of its author. Nevertheless, suggestions for inclusion of further material are appreciated as I intend to once in a while update this work.

1 Naive heuristic approach

Fix any prime q. We try to compute the density of primes p such that both $p \equiv 1 (\text{mod } q)$ and $g^{\frac{p-1}{q}} \equiv 1 (\text{mod } p)$. By Dirichlet's theorem $p \equiv 1 (\text{mod } q)$ is true for primes p with frequency $1/\varphi(q) = 1/(q-1)$. Note that $g^{\frac{p-1}{q}}$ is a solution of $x^q \equiv 1 (\text{mod } p)$. We expect there to be q solutions and we want a solution to be 1 modulo q. Thus we expect to be successful with probability $\frac{1}{q}$, except when $q \mid h$. Then $g^{\frac{p-1}{q}} = g_0^{h\frac{p-1}{q}} \equiv 1 (\text{mod } p)$, trivially. If we assume that these events are independent then the probability that both events occur is $\frac{1}{q(q-1)}$ if $q \nmid h$ and $\frac{1}{q-1}$ otherwise.

By (2) the above events should not occur for any q in order to ensure that $p \in \mathcal{P}(g)$. This suggests a natural density of

$$\prod_{q \nmid h} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q(q-1)}\right) \prod_{q \mid h} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q-1}\right) = A(h)$$

for such primes. That is we expect (1) to hold true.

2 Algebraic number theory

In order to understand Artin's approach to his conjecture we need some facts about algebraic number theory. We say α is *algebraic* over $\mathbb{Q}$ if it satisfies an equation of the form $f(\alpha) = 0$ with $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. We say α is an *algebraic* integer over $\mathbb{Q}$ if it satisfies an equation of the form $f(\alpha) = 0$, where $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is monic. A *number field* over $\mathbb{Q}$ is a field obtained by adjoining finitely many algebraic numbers $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s$ to $\mathbb{Q}$. That is, $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s)$. By $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s)$ we denote the smallest field containing $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s$ and $\mathbb{Q}$. The so called *theorem of the primitive element* asserts that for a given number field K there exists an algebraic integer α such that $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. The element α is said to be a *primitive element*. For an algebraic integer α let $f_\alpha(x)$ be the unique (as it turns out) monic polynomial $f_\alpha(x)$ of smallest degree such that $f_\alpha(\alpha) = 0$. Then $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(f_\alpha(x))$. The *degree* $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$ of K is defined as $\text{deg} f_\alpha(x)$. The *compositum* of two fields K and L is defined as the smallest field containing both K and L.

`Example`. Let $\alpha = i$. Then $f_i(x) = x^2 + 1$. Note that $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ contains elements of the form $\sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j x^j$. These elements correspond with an element in $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^2 + 1)$ obtained by replacing every x^2 by -1. Thus, as a set, $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^2 + 1) \cong \{a + bx \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Q}\}$. Similarly, as a set, $\mathbb{Q}(i) = \{a + bi \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Q}\}$. It is not difficult to see that a field isomorphism between $\mathbb{Q}(i)$ and $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^2 + 1)$ is given by sending x to i.

For a general number field K, we have the following picture :

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{Q}(\alpha) = K \arrow[r, phantom, "\supset"] & \mathcal{O}_K \\
\mathbb{Q} \arrow[u, phantom, "\cup"] \arrow[r, phantom, "\supset"] & \mathbb{Z} \arrow[u, phantom, "\cup"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here $\mathcal{O}_K$ is the *ring of integers* of the field K. It plays a role analogous to that of $\mathbb{Z}$ in $\mathbb{Q}$ (in our example $\mathcal{O}_K$ is $\mathbb{Z}[i] = \{a+bi|a,b \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ the *ring of Gaussian integers*). The *main theorem of arithmetic* states that, up to the order of factors, factorisation into primes in $\mathbb{Z}$ is unique. One might hope for a ring inside K with similar properties. Let us consider the set of algebraic integers over $\mathbb{Q}$ that are inside K. This set is actually a ring, the ring of integers, $\mathcal{O}_K$, of K. It usually does not have unique factorization in elements. It, however, has unique factorization into terms of *prime ideals* (up to order of factors). The prime ideal (p) in $\mathbb{Z}$ turns out to factor as $\mathfrak{P}_1^{e_1} \ldots \mathfrak{P}_g^{e_g}$ inside $\mathcal{O}_K$. The equivalent statement of $p = \#\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ in $\mathbb{Z}$, reads in $\mathcal{O}_K$: $p^{f_i} = \#\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{P}_i\mathcal{O}_K$. Here f_i is called the *degree* of the prime ideal $\mathfrak{P}_i$. We have the relationship $\sum_{i=1}^{g} e_i f_i = n$, with n the degree of K. We say that a rational prime p splits completely in $\mathcal{O}_K$ if $e_i = f_i = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, g$. Note that in this case $g = n$. If a prime p splits completely in the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_K$, with $K \cong \mathbb{Q}[x]/(f(x))$, then over $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, $f(x)$ splits into n distinct linear factors.

2.1 Analytic algebraic number theory

Let $\mathfrak{O}$ run through the non-zero integral ideals of $\mathcal{O}_K$, with K a number field. For $\Re(s) > 1$, we define $\zeta_K(s) = \sum_{\mathfrak{O}} N\mathfrak{O}^{-s}$ and elsewhere by analytic continuation. Note that if $K = \mathbb{Q}$, then $\zeta_K(s) = \zeta(s)$, the usual zeta-function. For $\Re(s) > 1$ we have an Euler product, $\zeta_K(s) = \prod_{\mathfrak{P}}(1 - N\mathfrak{P}^{-s})^{-1}$, where the product runs over all prime ideals $\mathfrak{P}$ of $\mathcal{O}_K$. In 1903, Landau proved the *Prime Ideal Theorem* to the effect that

$$\pi_K(x) := \sum_{N\mathfrak{P} \leqq x} 1 \sim \frac{x}{\log x}, \quad x \to \infty.$$

Assuming the *Riemann Hypothesis* for the field K, that is, assuming that all the non-trivial zeros of $\zeta_K(s)$ are on $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$, one obtains the much sharper estimate

$$\pi_K(x) = \mathrm{Li}(x) + O_K(\sqrt{x} \log x), \quad x \to \infty, \tag{3}$$

where the implied constant depends at most on K.

In the analysis of Artin's primitive root conjecture an infinite family of fields will play a role and we need an error term in (3) that is explicit in its dependency on K. Such a result was folklore and finally written down by Lang [24]:

$$\pi_K(x) = \mathrm{Li}(x) + O(\sqrt{x}\log(x^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}|D_K|)), \tag{4}$$

where D_K denotes the discriminant of the field K.

The function $\pi_K(x)$ is heavily biased towards prime ideals of degree one:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_k(x) &= \sum_{\substack{N\mathfrak{P}\leqq x\\ N\mathfrak{P}=p}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{N\mathfrak{P}\leqq x\\ N\mathfrak{P}=p^2}} 1 + \ldots \\ &= \sum_{\substack{N\mathfrak{P}\leqq x\\ N\mathfrak{P}=p}} 1 + O(\sum_{\substack{p^j\leqq x\\ j\geqq 2}} 1) = \sum_{\substack{N\mathfrak{P}\leqq x\\ N\mathfrak{P}=p}} 1 + O(\sqrt{x}). \end{aligned}$$

In Artin's problem one is specifically interested in so called *normal fields*. For such a field all prime ideals of degree one with at most finitely many exceptions, come from rational primes p that split completely. Throwing out these exceptions we have the following picture :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{P}_1\mathfrak{P}_2\ldots\mathfrak{P}_n & \qquad\qquad & \mathfrak{P}'_1\mathfrak{P}'_2\ldots\mathfrak{P}'_n \\ \ddots\vdots\iddots & & \ddots\vdots\iddots \\ p_1 & & p'_1 \end{array}$$

(A $[K:\mathbb{Q}]$-fold covering of the rational primes.) Thus, for a normal field we have

$$\pi_K(x) = [K:\mathbb{Q}] \sum_{\substack{p\leqq x\\ p \text{ splits completely in } K}} 1 + O(\sqrt{x}\log x),$$

that is, by the Prime Ideal Theorem,

$$\sum_{\substack{p\leqq x\\ p \text{ splits completely in } K}} 1 \sim \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}\frac{x}{\log x}, \quad x\to\infty. \tag{5}$$

This is a particular case of a very important result called the *Chebotarev density theorem*. For a nice introductory account see Lenstra and Stevenhagen [64].

`Example`. (Cyclotomic fields). A *cyclotomic field* K is a field of the form $K = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n)$ with $\zeta_n = e^{2\pi i/n}$ and n a natural number. One can show that

$$f_{\zeta_n}(x) = \prod_{\substack{a=1\\ (a,n)=1}}^{n} (x-\zeta_n^a) = \Phi_n(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x].$$

The polynomial $\Phi_n(x)$ is the nth *cyclotomic polynomial.* From this we deduce that $[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) : \mathbb{Q}] = \deg \Phi_n(x) = \varphi(n)$. The cyclotomic fields are normal. It can be shown that p splits completely in $K \iff p \equiv 1 (\text{mod } n) \iff x^n - 1$ factors completely over $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$.

On applying (5) we deduce that

$$\pi(x, n, 1) := \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv 1 (\text{mod } n)}} 1 \sim \frac{1}{\varphi(n)} \frac{x}{\log x}, \quad x \to \infty,$$

a particular case of Dirichlet's theorem. The same result can be deduced for the progressions $a(\text{mod } n)$ with $(a, n) = 1$ on invoking Chebotarev's density theorem.

3 Artin's heuristic approach

We have now the preliminaries available to follow the rest of the story on the progress made on Artin's primitive root conjecture. Remember that we are interested in the set of all primes p satisfying

$$\begin{cases} p \equiv & 1 (\text{mod } q) \\ g^{\frac{p-1}{q}} \equiv & 1 (\text{mod } p), \end{cases}$$

where q is any fixed prime. By what we have learned about cyclotomic fields the primes $p \equiv 1(\text{mod } q)$ are precisely those for which the equation $x^q \equiv 1(\text{mod } p)$ has q distinct solutions mod p. I claim that if $g^{\frac{p-1}{q}} \equiv 1(\text{mod } p)$, then $x^q \equiv g(\text{mod } p)$ has a solution mod p. To see this, write $g = \gamma^a$ with γ a primitive root mod p. Then $\gamma^{a\frac{p-1}{q}} \equiv 1(\text{mod } p)$. A power of a primitive root can only be congruent to $1(\text{mod } p)$ if the exponent is a multiple of $p-1$, hence $q \mid a$. This says $a = bq$. Then $(\gamma^b)^q \equiv g(\text{mod } p)$ and this proves the claim. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_q$ be the distinct mod p solutions of $x^q \equiv 1(\text{mod } p)$. Then we see that $\alpha_1\gamma^b, \ldots, \alpha_q\gamma^b$ are all distinct solutions of $x^q \equiv g(\text{mod } p)$. We conclude that a prime that satisfies $p \equiv 1(\text{mod } q)$ and $g^{\frac{p-1}{q}} \equiv 1(\text{mod } p)$ splits completely in the number field

$$k_q := \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_q, g^{\frac{1}{q}}). \tag{6}$$

(Note that it does not make a difference which qth root of g we take, in that we always end up with the same field.) We leave it to the reader to show that if p splits completely in k_q, then $p \equiv 1(\text{mod } q)$ and $g^{\frac{p-1}{q}} \equiv 1(\text{mod } p)$. Thus we have

$$\begin{cases} p \equiv & 1 (\text{mod } q) \\ g^{\frac{p-1}{q}} \equiv & 1 (\text{mod } p) \end{cases} \iff p \text{ splits completely in } k_q.$$

Let us denote the degree of k_q by $n(q)$. It is not difficult to show that k_q is normal. Hence we may apply (5) to deduce that the number of primes $p \le x$ that do not split completely in k_q equals $(1-1/n(q))x/\log x$, asymptotically. So one expects $\prod_q(1-1/n(q))$ as the density of primes p for which g is a primitive root mod p.

The latter heuristic argument was believed until about 1960, when the Lehmers [26] made some numerical calculations that did not seem to always match with Artin's heuristic. Then, in 1968, Heilbronn realized that the events 'p does not split completely in k_q' are not necessarily independent, as p and q range through all primes and published a corrected quantitative conjecture. Artin, however, made this correction much earlier, namely in 1958 in a letter to the Lehmers in a response to a letter of the Lehmers regarding his numerical work. Artin did not publish his corrected conjecture, nor did the Lehmer's refer to Artin in their paper [26], altough they give the correction factor. As late as 1964 Hasse provides a correction factor in the 1964 edition of his book [10] that is incorrect if $g \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ is *not* a prime. For some excerpts of the correspondence between Artin and the Lehmers see Stevenhagen [63].

Take for example $g = 5$, thus $h = 1$. Then $k_2 = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5}) \subsetneqq k_5 = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_5, 5^{1/5})$, i.e. k_2 is a subfield of k_5 (since $\sqrt{5} = \zeta_5 - \zeta_5^2 - \zeta_5^3 + \zeta_5^4$). Now if $K \subsetneqq L$ and p splits completely in L, then p must split completely in K. This means that the condition 'p does not split completely in k_2' implies the condition 'p does not split completely in k_5'. So, assuming that there are no further dependencies between the various conditions on q, we expect that

$$\mathcal{P}(5)(x) \sim \prod_{p \ne 5}\left(1 - \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right)\frac{x}{\log x}, \quad x \to \infty.$$

Note that the constant involved equals $20A/19$. This turns out to be more consistent with the numerical data than Artin's prediction A.

4 Modified heuristic approach (à la Artin)

Recall that k_q is defined in (6) for prime q. Let m be squarefree. We define k_m to be the compositum of the fields k_q with $q|m$ and prime. It can be shown that $k_m = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_m, g^{1/m})$. We are interested in the density of primes p that do not split completely in any k_q (if this exists). We can try to compute it by inclusion-exclusion. So we start writing down $1 - \frac{1}{n(2)} - \frac{1}{n(3)} \cdots$. However, we have counted double here the primes p that split completely in both k_2 and k_3. It can be shown that the primes that split completely in both k_n and k_m are precisely the primes that split completely in $k_{lcm(n,m)}$. Thus we have to add $\frac{1}{n(6)}$. Continuing in this fashion we arrive at the heuristic

$$\mathcal{P}(g)(x) \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)}{[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_k, g^{1/k}) : \mathbb{Q}]} \frac{x}{\log x}, \quad x \to \infty. \tag{7}$$

Here μ is the *Möbius function.* It is defined by $\mu(1) = 1$. If $n > 1$, then $\mu(n) := (-1)^s$, where s denotes the number of distinct prime factors of n if n is squarefree, and $\mu(n) := 0$ otherwise. If we are only interested in the primes p that do not split completely in any of $k_{q_1}, \ldots, k_{q_s}$, with s finite then there would be little to prove (on invoking Chebotarev's theorem). It is the *infinitely* many q that makes the problem hard.

Artin's heuristic amounts to assuming that fields k_{q_1} and k_{q_2} are *linearly independent* over $\mathbb{Q}$ (i.e. $k_{q_1} \cap k_{q_2} = \mathbb{Q}$), for distinct primes q_1 and q_2. This has as a consequence that $[k_{q_1 q_2} : \mathbb{Q}] = [k_{q_1} : \mathbb{Q}][k_{q_2} : \mathbb{Q}]$ and in general, for squarefree k that $n(k) = \frac{k\varphi(k)}{(k,h)}$. Thus, according to Artin we should have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)}{n(k)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)(k,h)}{k\varphi(k)} = \prod_{p \nmid h} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right) \prod_{p \mid h} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p-1}\right) = A(h),$$

where in the derivation of the last equality we used the fact that if $f(k)$ is a multiplicative function, then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |f(k)| < \infty \Rightarrow \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f(k) = \prod_{p} (1 + f(p) + f(p^2) + \cdots).$$

It can be shown that if $g \neq -1$ and g not equal to a square, then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)}{n(k)} = c_g A,$$

where $c_g > 0$ is a rational number depending on g. It turns out that numerically the heuristic (7) does not seem to be inconsistent with the numerical data. Let $g \neq -1$ or a square. Hooley [14] proved in 1967 that if the Riemann Hypothesis holds for the number fields $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_k, g^{1/k})$ with all squarefree k, then we have

$$\mathcal{P}(g)(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)}{[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_k, g^{1/k}) : \mathbb{Q}]} \frac{x}{\log x} + O\left(\frac{x \log\log x}{\log^2 x}\right) \tag{8}$$

and he explicitely evaluated the latter sum, say Σ, as

$$\Sigma = \begin{cases} A(h) & \text{if } d \not\equiv 1 (\text{mod } 4); \\ \left(1 - \mu(|d|) \prod_{\substack{p \mid d \\ p \mid h}} \frac{1}{p-2} \prod_{\substack{p \mid d \\ p \nmid h}} \frac{1}{p^2 - p - 1}\right) A(h) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

with d the discriminant of $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{g})$. For convenience we denote the assumption on the fields $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_k, g^{1/k})$ made by Hooley as Hooley's Riemann Hypothesis (HRH) and the error term $x \log\log x / \log^2 x$ as $R(x)$.

5 Hooley's work

For simplicity we assume $g = 2$ and sketch Hooley's proof [14]. The restriction $g = 2$ allows us to focus exclusively on the analytical aspects, the algebraic aspects being discussed elsewhere in this survey.

A large part of his paper is devoted to proving an estimate for

$$P(x,l) = \#\{p \leqq x : p \text{ splits completely in } k_l\},$$

for which the implied constant in the error term does not depend on l. His result on this is a special case of the result (4) of Lang [24] (proven a few years later):

$$P(x,l) = \mathrm{Li}(x) + O(\sqrt{x}\log(lx)), \tag{10}$$

where we assume the Riemann Hypothesis for k_l. Another quantity needed is

$$N(x,\eta) = \#\{p \leqq x : p \text{ does not split completely in } k_q,\ q \leqq \eta\}.$$

By inclusion-exclusion we have $N(x,\eta) = \sum_{l'} \mu(l')P(x,l')$, where l' ranges over all divisors of $\prod_{q\leqq\eta} q$. Note that

$$\prod_{q\leqq\eta} q = e^{\sum_{q\leqq\eta}\log q} \leqq e^{2\eta},$$

where we used that $\sum_{q\leqq\eta}\log q \sim \eta$ (which is equivalent with the Prime Number Theorem). Note that $\mathcal{P}(2)(x) = N(x, x-1)$. The problem in estimating $N(x,\eta)$ is that by using inclusion-exclusion and (10) is that we can only estimate $N(x,\eta)$ for rather small η, whereas one would like to take $\eta = x-1$ and so we are forced to work with $N(x,\eta)$ for η rather smaller than x. We will actually choose $\eta = \frac{\log x}{6}$ and thus $l' < e^{2\eta} = x^{1/3}$. Let us introduce a third quantity $M(x,\eta_1,\eta_2) = \#\{p \leqq x : p$ splits completely in some $k_q,\ \eta_1 < q < \eta_2\}$. It is easy to see that $N(x,\xi_1) - M(x,\xi_1,\xi_2) - M(x,\xi_2,\xi_3) \leqq \mathcal{P}(2)(x) \leqq N(x,\xi_1)$, that is,

$$\mathcal{P}(2)(x) = N(x,\xi_1) + O(M(x,\xi_1,\xi_2)) + O(M(x,\xi_2,\xi_3)) + O(M(x,\xi_3,x-1)).$$

We will choose $\xi_1 = \frac{\log x}{6}$, $\xi_2 = \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log^2 x}$ and $\xi_3 = \sqrt{x}\log x$. Note the small gap between ξ_2 and ξ_3. This is the 'hard region' and unfortunately it is out of reach to close it and work say with

$$\mathcal{P}(2)(x) = N(x,\xi_1) + O(M(x,\xi_1,\xi_2)) + O(M(x,\xi_2,x-1)).$$

Now using the estimate for $P(x,l)$ one easily arrives at

$$\begin{aligned} N(x,\xi_1) &= \mathrm{Li}(x)\sum_{l'\leqq x^{\frac{1}{3}}}\frac{\mu(l')}{l'\varphi(l')} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^2 x}\right) \\ &= A\mathrm{Li}(x) + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^2 x}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Again using the estimte for $P(x,q)$ we arrive at

$$M(x,\xi_1,\xi_2) \leqq \sum_{\xi_1 \leqq q \leqq \xi_2} P(x,q) = O\left(\frac{x}{\log^2 x}\right).$$

In the region (ξ_2,ξ_3) we use the fact that the primes p counted by $P(x,q)$ certainly satisfy $p \equiv 1 (\text{mod } q)$. Thus $P(x,q) \leqq \pi(x,q,1)$. Then using the Brun-Titchmarsh estimate

$$\pi(x,q,1) < \frac{2x}{\varphi(q)\log(x/q)}, \quad 1 \leqq q < x,$$

we obtain

$$M(x,\xi_2,\xi_3) \leqq \sum_{\xi_2 \leqq q \leqq \xi_3} P(x,q) \leqq \sum_{\xi_2 \leqq q \leqq \xi_3} \pi(x,q,1) = O(R(x)).$$

Finally, if a prime p is counted by $M(x,\xi_3,x-1)$, then its order is less than $\frac{x}{\xi_3} = \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x}$ and thus it divides $2^m - 1$ for some $m < \sqrt{x}/\log x$. Now

$$2^{M(x,\xi_3,x-1)} < \prod_{p \text{ counted by } M(x,\xi_3,x-1)} p \leqq \prod_{m < \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x}} (2^m - 1).$$

Thus

$$M(x,\xi_3,x-1) < \sum_{m < \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x}} m = O\left(\frac{x}{\log^2 x}\right).$$

On gathering all terms we obtain $\mathcal{P}(2)(x) = A\text{Li}(x) + O(R(x))$.

Repeating this argument for arbitrary $g \neq -1$ or a square, we arrive at (8) under HRH, which implies the truth of the qualitative form of Artin's primivite root conjecture and a modified form of the quantitative version.

5.1 Unconditional results

If one asks for unconditional results, the state of affairs is quite appalling. There is no known number g for which $\mathcal{P}(g)$ is known to be infinite ! In 1986, however, Heath-Brown [11] proved (improving on earlier fundamental work by Gupta and Ram Murty [8]) a result which implies that there are at most two primes q_1 and q_2 for which $\mathcal{P}(q_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}(q_2)$ are finite and at most three squarefree numbers s_1, s_2 and s_3 for which $\mathcal{P}(s_1)$, $\mathcal{P}(s_2)$ and $\mathcal{P}(s_3)$ are finite.

Remember the observation that if $q = 4p + 1$ and $p \equiv 2 (\text{mod } 5)$, then $q \in \mathcal{P}(10)$. Sieve theory cannot prove presently that there are infinitely many such primes. However, the so called lower bound sieve method combined with the Chen-Iwaniec switching method gave rise to $\gg \frac{x}{\log^2 x}$ primes

$p \leqq x$ such that either $p-1 = 2^e q$ for some prime q or $p-1 = 2^e q_1 q_2$ with $p^\alpha < q_1 < p^\delta$ for some $\alpha > \frac{1}{4}$ and $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$. This together with a rather elementary argument, is then enough to establish Heath-Brown's result.

Reznikov and Moree [55] established a variant of Heath-Brown's result and used it to make considerable progress regarding a conjecture of Lubotzky and Shalev to the extent that for all d sufficiently large the number of subgroups of index d in the fundamental group $\pi_1(M)$ of a hyperbolic three manifold M is at least $e^{dc(M)}$, for some positive constant $c(M)$ depending at most on M.

6 Probabilistic model

Let me consider the problem of finding a probabilistic model for a prime p to be such that g is a primitive root mod p. Herewith I mean finding a simple function $f_g(p)$ (if it exists) such that

$$\sum_{\substack{p\in S\\ p\leqq x}} f_g(p) \sim \sum_{\substack{p\in S,\ p\leqq x\\ g \text{ is a primitive root mod } p}} 1, \tag{11}$$

where S has to be a set of primes having a natural density.

There are $\varphi(p-1)$ primitive roots mod p and thus one could try to take $f_g(p) = \varphi(p-1)/(p-1)$ assuming the primitive roots are randomly distributed over $1,\ldots,p-1$. Results of Elliott, Cobeli & Zaharescu, Nongkynrih, Rudnick & Zaharescu indeed all suggest that the distribution of the primitive roots over $1,\ldots,p-1$ is to a large extent governed by Poisson processes. Thus we would hope to find something like

$$\sum_{p\leqq x} \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} \sim \mathcal{P}(g)(x), \quad x\to\infty. \tag{12}$$

However, by Hooley's theorem there are, under HRH, g_1 and g_2 such that $\mathcal{P}(g_1)(x) \not\sim \mathcal{P}(g_2)(x)$. Thus (12) cannot be true. Let us not be scared by this and try to evaluate $\sum_{p\leqq x}\frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1}$. Note that $\frac{\varphi(n)}{n} = \prod_{p|n}(1-\frac{1}{p}) = \sum_{d|n}\frac{\mu(d)}{d}$. Thus

$$\sum_{p\leqq x}\frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} = \sum_{p\leqq x}\sum_{d|(p-1)}\frac{\mu(d)}{d} = \sum_{d\leqq x}\frac{\mu(d)}{d}\sum_{\substack{p\leqq x\\ p\equiv 1(d)}} 1 = \sum_{d\leqq x}\frac{\mu(d)}{d}\pi(x,d,1).$$

Let c_1 be a fixed real number. Then the estimate

$$\pi(x,d,a) := \sum_{\substack{p\leqq x\\ p\equiv a(\text{mod } d)}} 1 = \frac{\mathrm{Li}(x)}{\varphi(d)} + O(xe^{-c_2\sqrt{\log x}}) \tag{13}$$

holds uniformly for all integers a and d such that $(a,d)=1$ and $1 \leq d \leq \log^{c_1} x$, with c_2 some positive constant. This is a well-known result due to Siegel and Walfisz. On applying it we obtain

$$\sum_{p \leqq x} \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} = \mathrm{Li}(x) \sum_{d \leqq \log^{c_1} x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d\varphi(d)} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^{c_1} x}\right) = A\mathrm{Li}(x) + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^{c_1} x}\right).$$

Recall that Artin's heuristic answer was not always correct because he failed to take into account quadratic interactions. So let us try to incorporate this into our model. In order that g is a primitive root mod p it is necessary that $(g/p)=-1$ and this is a quadratic condition. In particular if g has to be a primitive root it must be a non-square mod p. There are $\frac{p-1}{2}$ of them and then $2\varphi(p-1)/(p-1)$ is the density. Thus it makes sense to try to evaluate the sum in the identity below, which yields, assuming HRH, by a computation a little more complicated than for the sum with the condition $(g/p)=-1$ omitted:

$$2 \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \left(\frac{g}{p}\right)=-1}} \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} = \mathcal{P}(g)(x) + O(R(x)).$$

In case $h>1$ equality does not always hold. The effect we have to take into account there is that if $(p-1,h)>1$, then

$$g^{\frac{p-1}{(p-1,h)}} \equiv \left(g_0^{\frac{h}{(p-1,h)}}\right)^{p-1} \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\ p)$$

and thus g cannot be a primitive root mod p.

Here is my proposal for $f_g(p)$.

$$f_g(p) = \begin{cases} 2\frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} & \text{if } \left(\frac{g}{p}\right) = -1 \text{ and } (p-1,h)=1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

Then, it can be shown assuming HRH that

$$\sum_{p \leqq x} f_g(p) = \mathcal{P}(g)(x) + O(R(x)). \tag{15}$$

To my amazement, this result appeared to be new.

The traditional approach after the failure of the naive heuristic, is to show that it holds true on average :

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{g \leqq N} \mathcal{P}(g)(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{p \leqq x} M_p(N),$$

where $M_p(N)$ is the number of integers $g \leqq N$ which are primitive roots modulo p. Clearly $M_g(N) = \varphi(p-1)\{\frac{N}{p} + O(1)\}$. Thus

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{g\leqq N} \mathcal{P}(g)(x) = \sum_{p\leqq x} \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} + O\left(\frac{x^2}{N\log x}\right) + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^D x}\right),$$

provided that $N > x^2 \log^{D-1} x$. Less trivial unconditional results in this direction were obtained by Goldfeld [7] and Stephens [61].

It turns out to be relatively easy to compute the first sum in (11) with $S = \{p : p \equiv a(\text{mod } f)\}$ and one obtains a relatively complicated, but completely explicit, Euler product. The question is whether the true behaviour of $\mathcal{P}(g,f,a)(x) := \#\{p \leqq x : p \in \mathcal{P}(g),\ \ p \equiv a(\text{mod } f)\}$ matches up with this.

Lenstra's work [28], which introduced Galois theory into the subject, implies the following result on $\mathcal{P}(g,f,a)(x)$.

Theorem 1 *Let* $1 \leq a \leq f,\ (a,f) = 1$. *Let* σ_a *be the automorphism of* $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_f)$ *determined by* $\sigma_a(\zeta_f) = \zeta_f^a$. *Let* $c_a(n)$ *be* 1 *if the restriction of* σ_a *to the field* $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_f) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n, g^{1/n})$ *is the identity and* $c_a(n) = 0$ *otherwise. Put*

$$\delta(a,f,g) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)c_a(n)}{[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_f,\zeta_n,g^{1/n}) : \mathbb{Q}]}.$$

Then, assuming RH for all number fields $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_f,\zeta_n,g^{1/n})$ *with* n *squarefree,*

$$\mathcal{P}(g,f,a)(x) = \delta(a,f,g)\frac{x}{\log x} + O(R(x)).$$

Inspired by the relatively easy Euler product coming from quadratic heuristics, I set out to explicitely evaluate $\delta(a,f,g)$ and managed to find an Euler product for it. This is the same as the one found with quadratic heuristics ! As a consequence we have the following result [36], which generalizes (15):

Theorem 2 *Assume RH for all number fields* $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_f,\zeta_n,g^{1/n})$ *with* n *squarefree. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{p\leq x \\ p\equiv a(\text{mod } f)}} f_g(p) = \mathcal{P}(g,f,a)(x) + O(R(x)).$$

A rather more insightful derivation of the Euler product for $\delta(a,f,g)$ will appear in [29], as a consequence of a more explicit approach involving quadratic characters in the line of Lenstra's earlier work. This approach is the most powerful sofar in finding explicit Euler products for primitive root densities. For a preview of this work see Stevenhagen [63]. The upshot is that the density for a whole class of Artin type problems can be always written as

$$\delta = (1 + \prod_p E_p) \prod_p A_p,$$

where the E_p are (real)character averages and hence satisfy $-1 \le E_p \le 1$. Only finitely many of them are distinct from 1. The infinite product $\prod_p A_p$ can be regarded as the 'canonical' density of the problem at hand. In this formulation the situations where $\delta = 0$ can be relatively easily computed (from the expression of the density as an infinite sum this can be quite hard, cf. the formula for $\delta(a, f, g)$ in Theorem 1). For the original Artin problem a very easy computation yields $\prod_p A_p = A(h)$ and $1 + \prod_p E_p = E$ and one finds (9) again.

The explicit formula for $\delta(a, f, g)$ allows one to determine the f such that the primes in $\mathcal{P}(g)$ are equidistributed in the various primitive residue classes mod f. This was done earlier by me [35] using an Euler product for $\delta(1, f, g)$ (which is easier to obtain) and some Galois theoretic arguments. Basically f must be a power of two, in case $h = 1$. Also $2^\alpha 3^\beta$ can occur, the smallest integer instance being $g = 21^7$. These results imply the falsity of a conjecture of Rodier [56], under the usual RH proviso.

If S is a union of arithmetic progressions, then assuming a sufficiently strong generalisation of RH, it follows by Theorem 2 that equality holds with $f_g(p)$ chosen as in (14). This choice of $f_g(p)$ does not always work for arbitrary sets S having a natural density, for example when one chooses S to be the set of primes that split completely in $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_3, g^{1/3})$, in case g is not a cube.

7 The indicator function

7.1 The indicator function and probabilistic models

Let G be a finite cyclic group and put $f(g) = 1$ if G is generated by g and $f(g) = 0$ otherwise. It was already observed by Landau that

$$f(g) = \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \sum_{d|n} \frac{\mu(d)}{\varphi(d)} \sum_{\text{ord}\chi = d} \chi(g), \tag{16}$$

where the sum is over the characters χ of G having order d. Using this, one deduces that

$$\mathcal{P}(g)(x) = \sum_{p \le x} \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} \sum_{d|p-1} \frac{\mu(d)}{\varphi(d)} \sum_{\text{ord}\chi = d} \chi(g).$$

Now write $\mathcal{P}(g)(x) = \sum_{d \le x} S_d(x)$. Note that

$$S_1(x) = \sum_{p \le x} \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1}$$

and that

$$S_2(x) = -(\frac{g}{p}) \sum_{p \le x} \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1}.$$

The term $S_d(x)$ can be written as a linear combination of terms

$$\frac{1}{\pi(x)} \sum_{\substack{p \le x,\ p \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\ d) \\ p \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\ \delta)}} \left(\frac{g}{p}\right)_d,$$

where $(\frac{g}{p})_d$ denotes the d-th power residue symbol, cf. [27, p. 111]. In case g is squarefree these terms disappear for every $d > 2$ and δ. Hence we expect that

$$\mathcal{P}(g)(x) \sim (S_1(x) + S_2(x)) \sim 2 \sum_{\substack{p \le x \\ (\frac{g}{p}) = -1}} \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1}, \quad x \to \infty.$$

A slightly more complicated argument leads to the conjecture

$$\mathcal{P}(g)(x) \sim 2 \sum_{\substack{p \le x,\ (p-1,h)=1 \\ (\frac{g}{p}) = -1}} \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1}, \quad x \to \infty,$$

where g is not required to be squarefree. The problem in proving this (and hence a quantitative Artin's primitive root conjecture) is that we have 'too many error terms' and can only achieve this if it can be established that there is sufficient cancellation, which is out of reach presently.

The analog of the latter conjecture for the general index t case (cf. §8.6) is far from easy to infer by ad hoc methods (as we managed to do for $t = 1$ in the previous section), but can be merely computed using the approach sketched here. Furthermore, under the usual RH proviso this conjecture can then be shown to be true [37, Theorem 1].

The unconditional results on Artin's conjecture on average in [7, 61] where obtained on using the indicator function and estimates for character sums.

7.2 The indicator function in the function field setting

We now give another application of the identity (16). Let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be the finite field with $q = p^n$ elements. Recall that its multiplicative group is cyclic. Let $a(x)$ be a polynomial in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$. We are interested in the number of irreducible polynomials $p(x) \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$ such that $a(x)$ generates $(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(p(x))^*$. Recall that if $\deg p(x) = n$ then $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(p(x))$ is isomorphic with $\mathbb{F}_{p^n}$, where the isomorphism is given explicitly as follows: for $h(x) \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$, we write, using the Euclidean algorithm,

$$h(x) = p(x)q(x) + r(x), \text{ with either } r(x) = 0 \text{ or } 0 \le \deg r < \deg p = n.$$

Let $\rho \in \mathbb{F}_{p^n}$ be a root of $p(x)$. Then

$$h(\rho) = r(\rho) = a_0 + a_1\rho + \cdots + a_{n-1}\rho^{n-1},\ a_i \in \mathbb{F}_p$$

describes all the elements of $\mathbb{F}_{p^n}$. Thus, $a(x)$ generating $(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(p(x)))^*$ is equivalent to $a(\rho)$ generating $\mathbb{F}_{p^n}^*$.

Hence, to count the number of irreducible $p(x)$ of degree n for which $a(x)$ is a generator is tantamount to counting the number of ρ of degree n for which $a(\rho)$ generates $\mathbb{F}_{p^n}^*$. Indeed, since each $p(x)$ has n roots, we find that the number of irreducible polynomials of degree n in $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$ such that $a(x)$ generates $(\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(p(x)))^*$ is equal to the number of elements $\rho \in \mathbb{F}_{p^n}$ of degree n such that $a(\rho)$ generates $\mathbb{F}_{p^n}^*$ divided by n. The latter number, is on using (16), equal to

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{\substack{\rho\in\mathbb{F}_{p^n}\\ \deg\rho=n}} \frac{\varphi(p^n-1)}{p^n-1}\sum_{d|p^n-1}\frac{\mu(d)}{\varphi(d)}\sum_{\mathrm{ord}\chi=d}\chi(a(\rho)).$$

By inclusion-exclusion we find that the number of irreducible polynomials of degree n over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ equals

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{\substack{\rho\in\mathbb{F}_{p^n}\\ \deg\rho=n}} 1 = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{d|n}\mu(d)p^{\frac{n}{d}} = \frac{p^n}{n} + O\left(\frac{p^{\frac{n}{2}}}{n}\right).$$

(It is not difficult to show [38, Lemma 3] that $\sum_{d|n}\mu(d)t^{n/d} > 0$ for every $t > 1$ and hence that at least one irreducible polynomial of degree n over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ exists.) Thus the contribution from the main term (the term with $d = 1$) is

$$\frac{p^n + O(p^{\frac{n}{2}})}{n}\frac{\varphi(p^n-1)}{p^n-1},$$

and the error term is

$$\frac{\varphi(p^n-1)}{n(p^n-1)}\sum_{\substack{d|p^n-1\\ d>1}}\frac{\mu(d)}{\varphi(d)}\sum_{\mathrm{ord}\chi=d}\sum_{\substack{\rho\in\mathbb{F}_{p^n}\\ \deg\rho=n}}\chi(a(\rho)).$$

On applying Weil's estimate for character sums and imposing the appropriate conditions on $a(x)$, the truth of Artin's conjecture in this situation is then established, cf. [53].

A little knowledge of the history of Weil's estimate makes clear that we not always need to invoke this powerful and deep result. Weil, in a period when he felt depressed, turned to the works of Gauss and started reading hapazardly. He soon found himself awestruck by Gauss' approach in counting solutions mod p of homogenous equations of the form $x_0^m + \cdots + x_s^m$. This approach involves Gauss sums (and Jacobi sums). Weil then started musing about generalisations of this beautiful work and the rest is mathematical history.... Thus we would expect that in case $a(x) = x^m + c$ the required estimate for the error term can be obtained on using only Gauss sums over finite fields. This is indeed so, see [16].

The situation described here is a particular case of the Artin primitive root conjecture for function fields. Hasse, who was at the cradle of Artin's conjecture (Artin first formulated it in a discussion with Hasse), kept very interested in it throughout his life and tried to stimulate people to work on it, cf. [9]. One of them was his PhD student Bilharz [2], who in 1937 proved Artin's conjecture for function fields under the proviso that the RH for the zeta function corresponding to the function field would hold true. Indeed, much later this was proved by Weil and hence Artin's primitive root conjecture is true for function fields ! Bilharz result has been subsequently generalized by Hsu [15] to Carlitz modules (a particular case of Drinfeld modules of rank one). Rosen [57] in his well-written book devotes a whole chapter to Artin's primitive root conjecture in the function field setting.

8 Some variations of Artin's problem

8.1 Elliptic Artin

An excellent introduction to elliptic Artin can be found in [49] and we quote it here almost verbatim. For references we refer to that paper.

In 1976 Lang and Trotter [25] formulated elliptic analogues of the Artin primitive root conjecture. Suppose E is an elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}$ with a rational point of infinite order. A natural question is : How often does the prescribed point generate $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$, the group of points (mod p) ?

More precisely, let a be a rational point of infinite order. The problem is to determine the density of primes p for which $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is generated by $\bar{a}$, the reduction of $a(\text{mod } p)$. (Here in addition to primes of bad reduction, we may need to exclude primes dividing the denominators of the coordintes of a.) Such a point will be called a primitive point for these primes. Lang and Trotter conjectured that the density of primes for which a is a primitive point always exists. This is the elliptic analogue of Artin's primitive roots conjecture.

Of course, situations may (and do) arise when the density is zero. In such a case the set of primes for which a is a primitive point is finite (and often empty). If this is the case, then it is so for obvious reasons. So the statement is that if it is not the case for obvious reasons that there are only finitely many, then there are infinitely many and they have a density.

In considering the elliptic analogue, we see that two assertions are being made about a prime p for which a is a primitive point :
1) $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is cyclic.
2) $\langle \bar{a} \rangle \cong E(\mathbb{F}_p)$,
where with $\langle \bar{a} \rangle$ we denote the subgroup in $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ generated by the reduction mod p of the point a. Is it even true that $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is cyclic infintely often ? It was Serre who pointed out the relevance of this question. In a course at Harvard in the fall of 1976, he proved that Hooley's method can be adapted to show that the set of primes p with $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ cyclic is

$$\delta_E \frac{x}{\log x} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log x}\right), \text{ where } \delta_E = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)}{[\mathbb{Q}(E[k]) : \mathbb{Q}]}.$$

Here $\mathbb{Q}(E[k])$ is the number field obtained by adjunction of the coordinates of the k-division points of the elliptic curve E. It is the analogue of the Kummerian extension $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_k, g^{1/k})$. As noted by Serre, $\delta_E > 0$ if and only if E has an irrational 2-division point. That is, if E has the Weierstrauss model, $y^2 = x^3 + cx + d$, we require that $x^3 + cx + d$ has an irrational root. In the non-CM case, it is still unknown if $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is cyclic for a positive density of primes whenever E has an irrational 2-division point.

Some very recent work on the elliptic Artin conjecture is due to Alina Cojocaru.

8.2 Even order

Let $g \geq 2$ be an integer. As we saw in the introduction the question whether $\text{ord}_p(g) = p - 1$ for a prime p, is equivalent with the period of the decimal expansion of $1/p$ in base g being maximal. Krishnamurty wondered how often the period in these decimal expansions are even. This can be attacked by algebraic methods similar to those sketched above.

We say that a prime p *divides a sequence* of integers, if it divides at least one term of the sequence. Notice that

$$\text{ord}_p(g) \text{ is even } \iff g^x \equiv -1 (\text{mod } p) \text{ has a solution } \iff p | \{g^k + 1\}_{k=0}^{\infty}.$$

There is an unique $j \geq 1$ such that $p \equiv 1 + 2^j (\text{mod } 2^{j+1})$. Now $\text{ord}_g(p)$ is even if and only if

$$g^{\frac{p-1}{2^j}} \not\equiv 1 (\text{mod } p).$$

It is more natural to consider the g such that $\text{ord}_g(p)$ is odd, that is the set $\{p : 2 \nmid \text{ord}_g(p)\}$. Let

$$P_j = \{p : p \equiv 1 + 2^j (\text{mod } 2^{j+1}),\ 2 \nmid \text{ord}_g(p)\}.$$

Note that

$$P_j = \{p : p \equiv 1 + 2^j (\text{mod } 2^{j+1}),\ g^{\frac{p-1}{2^j}} \equiv 1 (\text{mod } p)\}.$$

Now P_j consists of the primes p that split completely in $\mathbb{Q}(g^{1/2^j}, \zeta_{2^j})$, but do not split completely in $\mathbb{Q}(g^{1/2^j}, \zeta_{2^{j+1}})$. Since $\{p :\ 2 \nmid \text{ord}_g(p)\} = \cup_{j=1}^{\infty} P_j$, and the P_j are disjoint, one expects that the natural density of the set $\{p :\ 2 \nmid \text{ord}_g(p)\}$) equals $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta(P_j)$, where $\delta(P_j) = \lim_{x\to\infty} P_j(x)/\pi(x)$. Now

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \delta(P_j) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{[\mathbb{Q}(g^{1/2^j}, \zeta_{2^j}) : \mathbb{Q}]} - \frac{1}{[\mathbb{Q}(a^{1/2^j}, \zeta_{2^{j+1}}) : \mathbb{Q}]} \right).$$

On taking $g = 2$ one expects, on computing the field degrees involved, that the density of prime divisors of the sequence $\{2^k + 1\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ equals

$$\delta = (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4}) + (\frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{8}) + \sum_{j\ge 3} (\frac{4}{4^j} - \frac{2}{4^j}) = \frac{7}{24}.$$

With natural density replaced by Dirichlet density, this result was proved by Hasse in 1966. The natural density of primitive divisors of sequences of the form $\{a^k + b^k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ with a and b integers was computed independently along similar lines by Ballot, Odoni and Wiertelak, see e.g. [1]. For the a sequence $\{a^k + b^k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ with a and b canonical, the density is 2/3. In particular, if $g = 10$ one finds that the primes p such that period of the decimal expansion of $1/p$ is even have density 2/3.

Note that this result, unlike Hooley's, is unconditional. Both involve infinite towers of field extensions, but the one appearing in this problem is so sparse (in the sense that the degrees of the fields quickly increase) that the profusion of error terms that occurs in the Artin primitive root conjecture, does not arise and one can afford working with the relatively large error terms in $\pi_K(x)$ that are conditionally known. A probabilistic model for $\text{ord}_p(g)$ to be even was found by Moree [42].

Instead for asking when $2|\text{ord}_p(g)$, one can ask for $m|\text{ord}_p(g)$ or for $(m, \text{ord}_p(g)) = 1$ etc.. These questions, with sharp error terms, are dealt with in various papers of Wiertelak, see [43] for references. Again it turns out the corresponding density exists and is a rational number. Wiertelak gave a complicated expression for this density in case of the '$m|\text{ord}_p(g)$' problem, that was substantially simplified by Pappalardi [52]. Pappalardi's expression was simplified by Moree [43], who based himself on a simple to prove, apparently unknown before, identity for the associated counting function ([43, Proposition 1]).

8.3 Order in a prescribed arithmetic progression

The problem of determining for how many primes $p \le x$ one has $\text{ord}_p(g) \equiv a(\text{mod } d)$, with a and d prescribed integers was first considered by Chinen and Murata [4] in case $d = 4$. In this generality the problem turns out to be much harder than the case where $d|a$. Under an appropriate generalization of RH it turns out that $\delta_g(a,d)$, the density of primes $p \le x$ such that $\text{ord}_p(g) \equiv a (\text{mod } d)$, exists [40, Part II]. Let $N_g(a,d)(x)$ be the associated counting function. The latter proof starts with noting the identity

$$N_g(a,d)(x) = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \#\{p \le x : r_g(p) = t,\ p \equiv 1 + ta (\text{mod } dt)\},$$

where $r_g(p) = (p-1)/\text{ord}_g(p)$ denotes the residual index. The individual terms can be dealt with a variation of Hooley's method, where now one also needs to keep track of the dependence on t. The more novel aspects of the work rest in making the resulting formula for $\delta_g(a,d)$ more explicit, which requires algebraic number theory.

The much simpler quantity $\delta(a,d)$, the average density of elements of order $\equiv a (\text{mod } d)$ in a field of prime characteristic also exists [39]. It turns out that under the latter RH variant for almost all g with $|g| \le x$ one has $\delta_g(a,d) = \delta(a,d)$. Moreover, if $\delta_g(a,d) \ne \delta(a,d)$, then they tend to be close. Nevertheless, it is possible to find specific g (usually appropriately chosen high powers of a small basis number), for which $\delta_g(a,d)$ shows highly non-canonical behaviour. Despite the subtle arithmetic behaviour of $\delta_g(a,d)$, there are some surprises. For example, if $g > 0$ then always $\delta_g(1,4) \le \delta_g(3,4)$. My experience that a rational density in an Artin type problem indicates that the associated tower of field extension is rather sparse, seems to be invalid in this context.

The analogous problem of determining for how many primes $p \le x$ the residual index is in a prescribed congruence class modulo d was first studied by Pappalardi [50]. This turns out to be a much easier problem and thus it is perhaps a bit surprising that the results obtained have a rather similar format.

8.4 Divisors of second order recurrences

The sequences $\{a^k + b^k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ are special cases of sequences satisfying a second order linear recurrence and one can wonder about prime divisors of such recurrences in general, cf. [1]. A general linear second order recurrence has the form $u_{n+2} = cu_{n+1} + du_n$. Once the values of u_0 and u_1 are given, it is uniquely determined. The *characteristic polynomial* associated to the recurrence is defined as $X^2 - cX - d$. If this polynomial is reducible over $\mathbb{Q}$, then the recurrence has the form $R = \{ca^k - db^k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, finding the prime divisors amounts to finding the prime divisors of the sequence with general term $(a/b)^k - d/c = \alpha^k - \beta$. Now p is a prime divisor of R, with at most finitely many exceptions, if and only if $\text{ord}_p(\beta)|\text{ord}_p(\alpha)$. This can be phrased differently by saying that, with at most finitely many exceptions, p divides

R if and only if the subgroup mod p generated by β, $\langle\beta\rangle$, is contained in the subgroup $\langle\alpha\rangle$. One can then base a two variable Artin conjecture on this, of which the qualitative form says that the sequence R should have infinitely many prime divisors. This form is not too difficult to prove, as was done by Pólya around 1920, cf. [46]. To investigate the quantitative form, we put $S(x)=\sum_{p\le x,\ p|R}1$. Then

$$S(x)=\sum_{p\le x}\sum_{\substack{w|p-1\\ \mathrm{ord}_p(\beta)|\mathrm{ord}_p(\alpha)=(p-1)/w}}1=\sum_{w\le x-1}\sum_{\substack{p\le x\\ p\equiv 1(\mathrm{mod}\ w)\\ \mathrm{ord}_p(\beta)|\mathrm{ord}_p(\alpha)=(p-1)/w}}1.$$

Now $p\equiv 1(\mathrm{mod}\ w)$ and $\mathrm{ord}_p(\beta)|\mathrm{ord}_p(\alpha)=(p-1)/w$ if and only if p splits completely in $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha^{1/w},\beta^{1/w},\zeta_w)$ and p does not split completely in any of the fields $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha^{1/qw},\beta^{1/w},\zeta_{qw})$, with q a prime. Denote the degree of the latter field by $n(qw)$. Then, as $x\to\infty$, the limit $S(x)/\pi(x)$ tends to

$$\sum_{w=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{\mu(k)}{n(kw)},\tag{17}$$

provided a sufficiently strong generalisation of RH is true. The sum (17) equals a rational number times the *Stephens constant*

$$S=\prod_p\left(1-\frac{p}{p^3-1}\right)\approx 0.5759599688929\cdots$$

(The Stephens constant can also be evaluated with high numerical precision by expressing in terms of zetavalues at integer arguments [38].) This result is due to Moree and Stevenhagen [46] and improves on earlier work by Stephens [62]. Stephens evaluation of (17) (who restricted himself to the case where both α and β are integers) is not always correct and corrected in [46].

Note that the problem considered here is a variant of Artin's primitive root conjecture that is more complicated than the original one, whereas the variant discussed in §8.2 is easier, although both deal with second order recurrences. Lagarias made a similiar experience: in [23] he showed that the set of primes dividing some Lucas number L_n (defined by $L_0=2$, $L_1=1$ and $L_{n+1}=L_n+L_{n-1}$) has natural density 2/3, and remarked that his method does not work for the sequence a_n defined by $a_0=3$, $a_1=1$ and $a_{n+1}=a_n+a_{n-1}$. Moree and Stevenhagen [47] showed that under an appropiate generalisation of RH this density equals

$$\frac{1573727}{1569610}S\approx 0.577470679956\ldots$$

Much more material on recurrences can be found in the book [5].

8.5 Lenstra's work

The most far reaching generalisation of the Artin primitive root conjecture was considered by Lenstra [28], in the context of his research on Euclidean number fields : Let K be a global field and F a finite normal extension of K. Let C be a subset of $\mathrm{Gal}(F/K)$ which is stable under conjugation and let d be a positive integer (coprime to the characteristic of K in the case of a function field). Consider a finitely generated subgroup W of K^* which has, modulo torsion, rank $r \geqq 1$, and let M be the set of prime ideals $\mathfrak{P}$ of K satisfying

1. the Artin symbol $(\mathfrak{P}, F/K) \subseteq C$
2. the normalized exponential valuation attached to $\mathfrak{P}$ satisfies $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathfrak{P}}(w) = 0$ for all $w \in W$.
3. if $\psi : W \to \bar{K}^*_{\mathfrak{P}}$ is the natural map, then the index of $\psi(W)$ in $\bar{K}^*_{\mathfrak{P}}$ divides d.

Here $\bar{K}^*_{\mathfrak{P}}$ denotes the multiplicative group of $\bar{K}_{\mathfrak{P}}$, the residue class field at $\mathfrak{P}$. Lenstra conjectured that M has a density. He also obtained necessary and sufficient conditions for this density to be nonzero, under a sufficiently strong generalisation of RH. His main result implies Theorem 1 for example. Lenstra applied it to show, under the usual RH proviso, that certain principal ideal rings are euclidean.

8.6 Varia

We mention some other related results without delving deeply into the mathematics involved.

1) *How many primes p are there are such that $p-1$ is squarefree ?* There are two lines of attack. One is à la Artin's primitive root conjecture. In this approach one notes that $p-1$ is squarefree if and only if p does not split completely in any of the cyclotomic fields $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{q^2})$, where q runs over all primes. By inclusion-exclusion this gives then the conjectural natural density $\delta = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(n)/[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{n^2}) : \mathbb{Q}]$. The latter sum is easily seen to equal A. An approach to this problem in this spirit was made by H.-W. Knobloch [20, 9], a student of Hasse. It turns out, however, that a quite elementary proof is possible. It was found by Mirsky [34]. This uses the trivial identity $\sum_{d^2|n} \mu(d) = 1$ if n is not squarefree and zero otherwise. Note that the number of primes $p \le x$ such that $p-1$ is squarefree equals $\sum_{p \le x} \sum_{a^2|p-1} \mu(a)$. Now swap the order of summation. The inner sum is a prime counting sum and can be estimated by the Siegel-Walfisz theorem (13) for a small enough. The contribution from all large a we can trivially estimate. Carrying out this procedure gives us the same sum for the density δ as found in the earlier approach. (Mirsky gives the details of another proof and then for the relevant one for our purposes says it can be done similarly. This is worked out, however, in more detail in e.g. Moree and Hommersom [44, pp. 17–20].) For more information see also the September 2004 entries of the NMBRTHRY archives.

2) Note that g is a primitive root mod p if the subgroup generated by $\bar{g}$, the reduction of g mod p, equals $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$. If $g_1, \cdots, g_r$ are rational numbers, one can wonder about the density of primes $p \le x$ such that $\langle \bar{g}_1, \cdots, \bar{g}_r \rangle$ is the full multiplicative group $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$, see e.g. [3], or about the density such that each g_i, $1 \le i \le r$, is a primitive root [33]. In this direction Pappalari [51] studied a conjecture of Brown and Zassenhaus to the extent that if $p_1, \cdots, p_r$ denote the first r primes, then for all but $o(\pi(x))$ primes $p \le x$, $\langle \bar{p}_1, \cdots, \bar{p}_r \rangle$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$ if $r = [\log p]$. Pappalardi showed that under the usual RH proviso the Brown-Zassenhaus conjecture holds true.

3) Fix an integer t. For the primes $p \equiv 1(\text{mod } t)$ we can ask for the subset of them such that $\langle \bar{g} \rangle$ generates a subgroup of index t in $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$, see [37] and the references given there.

4) The definition of primitive roots was extended by Carmichael to that of *primitive λ-roots* for composite moduli n, which are integers with the maximal order modulo n. Let $N_g(x)$ be the number of natural numbers up to x for which g is a primitive λ-root. One might wonder then, in analogy with Artin's conjecture, whether $N_g(x) \sim B(g)x$ for some positive constant $B(g)$ depending on g, perhaps with some exceptional values of g. Li [30] provides results suggesting that $N_g(x)/x$ does not typically tend to a limit, see also [31, 32] for further results.

5) Pappalardi [52] studied the problem of determining how many primes $p \le x$ there are such that $\text{ord}_p(g)$ is squarefree (and similarly $\text{ord}_m(g)$, where m ranges over the integers $\le x$ for which the latter order is defined).

6) Recall that g is a primitive root mod p if p does not split completely in any of the fields k_q. Goldstein considered the more general problem where the fields k_q are replaced by normal number fields L_q and made a conjecture which was subsequently disproved by Weinberger. Goldstein then proved a restrictive version of his conjecture, which result was improved upon by Ram Murty [48].

7) Brizolis conjectured that for every prime $p > 3$ there exists an x and a primitive root $g(\text{mod } p)$ such that $x \equiv g^x(\text{mod } p)$. Let $N(p)$ denote the number of $1 \le x \le p-1$ such that x is a primitive root mod p and x and $p-1$ are coprime. It is easy to see that if $N(p) \ge 1$, then Brizolis' conjecture is true for the prime p. Let $\omega(n)$ denote the number of distinct prime divisors of n and $d(n)$ the number of divisors of n. Cobeli and Zaharescu and, independently Wen Peng Zhang, using character sums and the Weil bounds, proved that

$$N(p) = \frac{\varphi(p-1)^2}{p-1} + O(\sqrt{p}\ 4^{\omega(p-1)} \log p),$$

and used this to show that Brizolis' conjecture is true for every prime $p > 10^{50}$. Apparently the full Brizolis conjecture was recently settled by M. Campbell and C. Pomerance [54]. Note that if $x \equiv g^x (\mathrm{mod}\ p)$, then x is 1-cycle under taking the discrete logarithm with respect to g. For small k, k-cycles of the discrete logarithm problem are studied in Holden and Moree [12, 13].

8) Erdős conjectured that there are infinitely many integers n such that $\Omega(n) = \Omega(n+1)$, where $\Omega(n)$ denotes the total number of prime divisors of n and a similar result for $\omega(n)$. The former conjecture was proved in 1984 by Heath-Brown, but the latter remains open. J. Kan [17] proved the intriguing result that it cannot be true that both the latter conjecture and the qualitative form of Artin's primitive conjecture are false.

9) Over arbitrary number fields, there are two obvious ways in which Artin's conjecture can be generalized. Fix a number field K with ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_K$, and a nonzero element $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$, which is not a root of unity. We expect the following generalization to hold: the set of primes $\mathfrak{p}$ of K for which α generates the cyclic group $(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_K)^*$ has a density inside the set of all primes of K. Moreover, the situation is highly similar to the rational case, as the set of primes $\mathfrak{p}$ of K for which $(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_K)^*$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^*$ has density 1. In 1975 Cooke and Weinberger proved that this generalization of Artin's conjecture is indeed true and the density is given by the infinite sum in (8) with $\mathbb{Q}$ replaced by K, if an appropriate generalization of RH holds.

Roskam [59] considers a generalization of Artin's conjecture in a "rational" direction: the set of rational primes p for which the order of α in $(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_K)^*$ is equal to the exponent of this group has a density inside the set of all rational primes. He proves that, assuming an appriopiate generalization of RH is true, this conjecture holds for quadratic fields K. A less general result in this direction he established in [58] (but with a rather easier proof). Kitaoka and various of his pupils are very presently very actively working on Artin's conjecture for units (rather than general elements) in number fields, cf. [19].

10) Let A be a hyperbolic matrix in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, that is a matrix with absolute trace greater than 2. We may define $\mathrm{ord}_n(A)$ to be the order of A in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$. It can be shown that for a hyperbolic matrix in $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{Z})$ there is a density-one sequence of integers n such that its order mod n is slightly larger than $\sqrt{n}$. This is a crucial ingredient in an ergodicity theorem regarding eigenstates of quantized linear maps A of the torus ('cat maps'), see Kurlberg and Rudnick [22]. Under an appropriate generalisation of RH it can be shown [21] that for almost all n we have $\mathrm{ord}_n(A) \gg n^{1-\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. Since the eigenvalues of A are units in a quadratic number field, this problem is closely related to that discussed under part IX.

11) R. Griffin (a mathematical amateur) thought in 1957 that the decimal expansions of $1/p$ should have period length $p-1$ for all primes of the form $10X^2+7$. The first 16 primes p of the form $10X^2+7$ have indeed decimal period $p-1$, but this is not true for $p = 7297$, the 17th such prime. D. Lehmer found in 1963 that 326 is a primitive root for the first 206 primes of the form $326X^2+3$. More impressive examples in the same spirit can be given using recent results on prime producing quadratics. Y. Gallot holds the current record in which 206 is being replaced by 31082. For more information on this topic see Moree [41].

12) Interest in prime divisors of binomial coefficients dates back at least to Chebyshev. It is not difficult to see that unless k is fairly close to one of the ends of the range $0 \le k \le n$, then the coefficient $\binom{n}{k}$ contains many prime factors and many of these occur with high multiplicity. Erdős made a number of conjectures quantifying these observations, one well-known conjecture being that the middle coefficient $\binom{2n}{n}$ is not squarefree for any $n > 4$. Granville and Ramaré proved this conjecture in 1996. The corresponding problem for q-binomial and, more generally, q-multinomial coefficients is much more complicated. Sander [60] showed how Artin's primtive root conjecture implies the respective results.

13) Let q be the order of a finite field. If $(n,q) = 1$, then it can be shown that X^n-1 factors into

$$i_q(n) = \sum_{d|n} \frac{\varphi(d)}{\mathrm{ord}_q(d)}$$

distinct irreducible factors over $\mathbb{F}_q$. The quantity $i_q(n)$ appears in various mathematical settings, for example in Ulmer's study of elliptic curves with large rank over function fields [65] (see Moree and Solé [45] for further examples). The study of $i_q(n)$ quickly leads into Artin primitive root type problems [45].

Acknowledgement. I'd like to thank Zeev Rudnick for inviting me to give the talk this manuscript is based on and Jilyana Cazaran (Louisiana State University) for kindly typing the initial version of these lecture notes from my handwritten ones. My trip to Oberwolfach was paid for from Prof. Opdam's NWO-PIONEER fund.

References

[1] C. Ballot, Density of prime divisors of linear recurrences, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **115** (1995), no. 551, viii+102 pp..

[2] H. Bilharz, Primdivisoren mit vorgegebener Primitivwurzel, *Math. Ann.* **114** (1937), 476–492.

[3] L. Cangelmi and F. Pappalardi, On the r-rank Artin conjecture. II, *J. Number Theory* **75** (1999), 120–132.

[4] K. Chinen and L. Murata, On a distribution property of the residual order of $a(\bmod p)$. I, II, *J. Number Theory* **105** (2004), 60–81; 82–100.

[5] G. Everest, Graham, A. van der Poorten, I. Shparlinski and T. Ward, *Recurrence sequences*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **104**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003. xiv+318 pp..

[6] K. Girstmair, A "popular" class number formula, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **101** (1994), 997–1001.

[7] M. Goldfeld, Artin's conjecture on the average, *Mathematika* **15** (1968), 223–226.

[8] R. Gupta and M. Ram Murty, A remark on Artin's conjecture, *Invent. Math.* **78** (1984), 127–130.

[9] H. Hasse, Über die Artinsche Vermutung und verwandte Dichtefragen, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fennicae. Ser. A. I. Math.-Phys.* 1952, (1952). no. 116, 17 pp.

[10] H. Hasse, *Vorlesungen über Zahlentheorie*, Akademie-Verlag, 1950.

[11] D.R. Heath-Brown, Artin's conjecture for primitive roots, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* **37** (1986), 27–38.

[12] J. Holden and P. Moree, *New conjectures and results for small cycles of the discrete logarithm*, High primes and misdemeanours: lectures in honour of the 60th birthday of Hugh Cowie Williams, 245–254, Fields Inst. Commun. **41**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004.

[13] J. Holden and P. Moree, Some heuristics and results for small cycles of the discrete logarithm, arXiv:math.NT/0401013, to appear in Mathematics of Computation.

[14] C. Hooley, Artin's conjecture for primitive roots, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **225** (1967), 209–220.

[15] C.-N. Hsu, On Artin's conjecture for the Carlitz module, *Compositio Math.* **106** (1997), 247–266.

[16] E. Jensen and M.R. Murty, Artin's conjecture for polynomials over finite fields, Number theory, 167-181, Trends Math., Birkhuser, Basel, 2000.

[17] J. Kan, A note on two conjectures, *Acta Arith.* **111** (2004), 1–3.

[18] A. Khare, Divisibility tests and recurring decimals in Euclidean domains, arXiv:math.NT/0406025, submitted.

[19] Y. Kitaoka, Distribution of units of a cubic field with negative discriminant, *J. Number Theory* **91** (2001), 318–355.

[20] H.-W. Knobloch, Über Primzahlreihen nebst Anwendung auf ein elementares Dichteproblem, *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* **19** (1954), 1–13.

[21] P. Kurlberg, On the order of unimodular matrices modulo integers, *Acta Arith.* **110** (2003), 141–151.

[22] P. Kurlberg and Z. Rudnick, On quantum ergodicity for linear maps of the torus, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **222** (2001), 201–227.

[23] J.C. Lagarias, The set of primes dividing the Lucas numbers has density 2/3, *Pacific J. Math.* **118** (1985), 449–461; errata, ibid. **162** (1994), 393–396.

[24] S. Lang, On the zeta function of number fields, *Invent. Math.* **12** (1971), 337–345.

[25] S. Lang and H. Trotter, Primitive points on elliptic curves, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **83** (1977), 289-292.

[26] D.H. Lehmer and Emma Lehmer, *Heuristics, anyone ?*, in "Studies in Mathematical Analysis and Related Topics," pp. 202–210, Stanford Univ. Press, Stanford, CA, 1962.

[27] F. Lemmermeyer, *Reciprocity laws. From Euler to Eisenstein.*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000. xx+487 pp..

[28] H.W. Lenstra, jr., On Artin's conjecture and Euclid's algorithm in global fields, *Invent. Math.* **42** (1977), 202–224.

[29] H.W. Lenstra, jr., P. Moree and P. Stevenhagen, Character sums for primitive root densities, in preparation.

[30] S. Li, Artin's conjecture on average for composite moduli, *J. Number Theory* **84** (2000), 93–118.

[31] S. Li and C. Pomerance, *Primitive roots: a survey*, Number theoretic methods (Iizuka, 2001), 219–231, Dev. Math., 8, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2002.

[32] S. Li and C. Pomerance, On generalizing Artin's conjecture on primitive roots to composite moduli, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **556** (2003), 205–224.

[33] K.R. Matthews, A generalisation of Artin's conjecture for primitive roots, *Acta Arith.* **29** (1976), 113–146.

[34] L. Mirsky, The number of representations of an integer as the sum of a prime and a k-free integer, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **56** (1949), 17–19.

[35] P. Moree, Uniform distribution of primes having a prescribed primitive root, *Acta Arith.* **89** (1999), 9–21.

[36] P. Moree, Primes in arithmetic progression having a prescribed primitive root, *J. Number Theory* **78** (1999), 85–98.

[37] P. Moree, Asymptotically exact heuristics for (near) primitive roots, *J. Number Theory* **83** (2000), 155–181.

[38] P. Moree, Approximation of singular series and automata, *Manuscripta Math.* **101** (2000), 385–399.

[39] P. Moree, On the average number of elements in a finite field with order or index in a prescribed residue class, *Finite Fields Appl.* **10** (2004), 438–463.

[40] P. Moree, On the distribution of the order and index of $g(\bmod p)$ over residue classes I, to appear in the Journal of Number Theory, II, arXiv:math.NT/0404339, submitted, III, arXiv:math.NT/0405527, submitted.

[41] P. Moree, Primitive root producing quadratics, arXiv:math.NT/0406033, submitted.

[42] P. Moree, Asymptotically exact heuristics for prime divisors of $\{a^k+b^k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, arXiv:math.NT/0311483, submitted.

[43] P. Moree, On primes p for which d divides $\mathrm{ord}_p(g)$, arXiv:math.NT/040742, submitted.

[44] P. Moree and H. Hommersom, Value distribution of Ramanujan sums and of cyclotomic polynomial coefficients, arXiv:math.NT/0307352 .

[45] P. Moree and P. Solé, Around Pelikán's conjecture on very odd sequences, arXiv:math.NT/0407084, submitted.

[46] P. Moree and P. Stevenhagen, A two-variable Artin conjecture, *J. Number Theory* **85** (2000), 291–304.

[47] P. Moree and P. Stevenhagen, Prime divisors of the Lagarias sequence, *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* **13** (2001), 241–251.

[48] M.R. Murty, An analogue of Artin's conjecture for abelian extensions, *J. Number Theory* **18** (1984), 241–248.

[49] M.R. Murty, *Artin's conjecture and elliptic analogues*, Sieve methods, exponential sums, and their applications in number theory (Cardiff, 1995), 325–344, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 237, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[50] F. Pappalardi, On Hooley's theorem with weights, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino* **53** (1995), 375–388.

[51] F. Pappalardi, On the r-rank Artin conjecture, *Math. Comp.* **66** (1997), 853–868.

[52] F. Pappalardi, Square free values of the order function, *New York J. Math.* **9** (2003), 331–344 (electronic).

[53] F. Pappalardi and I. Shparlinski, On Artin's conjecture over function fields, *Finite Fields Appl.* **1** (1995), 399–404.

[54] C. Pomerance, personal communication.

[55] A. Reznikov and P. Moree, Three-manifold subgroup growth, homology of coverings and simplicial volume, *Asian J. Math.* **1** (1997), 764–768.

[56] F. Rodier, Estimation asymptotique de la distance minimale du dual des codes BCH et polynômes de Dickson, *Discrete Math.* **149** (1996), 205–221.

[57] M. Rosen, *Number theory in function fields*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **210**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002. xii+358 pp. ISBN: 0-387-95335-3

[58] H. Roskam, A quadratic analogue of Artin's conjecture on primitive roots, *J. Number Theory* **81** (2000), 93–109.

[59] H. Roskam, Artin's primitive root conjecture for quadratic fields, *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* **14** (2002), 287–324.

[60] J.W. Sander, Prime power divisors of multinomial coefficients and Artin's conjecture, *J. Number Theory* **46** (1994), 372–384.

[61] P.J. Stephens, An average result for Artin's conjecture, *Mathematika* **16** (1969), 178–188.

[62] P.J. Stephens, Prime divisors of second-order linear recurrences. I, II, *J. Number Theory* **8** (1976), 313–332; 333–345.

[63] P. Stevenhagen, The correction factor in Artin's primitive root conjecture, *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* **15** (2003), 383–391.

[64] P. Stevenhagen and H.W. Lenstra, jr., Chebotarev and his density theorem, *Math. Intelligencer* **18** (1996), 26–37.

[65] D. Ulmer, Elliptic curves with large rank over function fields, *Ann. of Math.* **155** (2002), 295–315.

PIETER MOREE
MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK,
VIVATSGASSE 7
D-53111 BONN, DEUTSCHLAND
e-mail address: moree@mpim-bonn.mpg.de